

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE     | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|---|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/699,815  | 11/04/2003      | Hiroyuki Ishida      | Q77547                  | 4439             |  |
| 23373   | 7590 12/06/2005 |                      | EXAMINER                |                  |  |
| SUGHRUE MION, PLLC<br>2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.<br>SUITE 800<br>WASHINGTON, DC 20037 |                 |                      | REHM, A                 | REHM, ADAM C     |  |
|   |                 |                      | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER     |  |
|   |                 |                      | 2875                    |                  |  |
|   |                 |                      | DATE MAILED: 12/06/2005 |                  |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|  | Application No.  | Applicant(s)   |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  | 10/699,815   | ISHIDA ET AL.  |  |  |  |  |
| Office Action Summary  | Examiner   | Art Unit   |  |  |  |  |
|  | Adam C. Rehm   | 2875   |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Period for Reply   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tirr vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE | 1. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133). |  |  |  |  |
| Status   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 Se   | eptember 2005.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☒ This   | This action is FINAL. 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·— ··  | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is  |  |  |  |  |  |
| closed in accordance with the practice under E   | x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45   | 53 O.G. 213.   |  |  |  |  |
| Disposition of Claims  | 0  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5,7 and 9-12</u> is/are pending in the a   | pplication.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5, 7 and 9-12</u> is/are rejected.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.  | 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or  | r election requirement.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Application Papers   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine   | r.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex   | aminer. Note the attached Office   | Action or form PTO-152.  |  |  |  |  |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> </ol>   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list   | of the certified copies not receive  | :d.  |  |  |  |  |
| Attachment(s)  | ,<br>  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> </ol>   | 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date   |  | ratent Application (PTO-152)   |  |  |  |  |

Art Unit: 2875

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 1. Claims 1-5, 7, 9, 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MURATA (US 4,935,665) and LEE (US 6,637,922).
- 2. MURATA discloses:
  - A semiconductor light-emitting element (Fig. 1, 2);
  - An optical system (Fig. 1 generally) comprising at least one of a reflector (14/15, Column 3, Lines 46-48) and an oval lens that is rotationally asymmetrical relative to an optical axis (31, Fig. 16);
  - A focal point of said optical system being on or near a light-emitting surface
     (3) of said light-emitting element (Fig. 1, Column 4, Lines 32-43);
  - Said light-emitting surface having a horizontally elongated shape in a
    direction orthogonal to an optical axis of said light-emitting element when
    viewed in the direction of the optical axis of said light-emitting element (Fig.
    12, 3);
  - Said optical system forming a light distribution pattern by enlarging a light pattern of said light-emitting surface in a horizontal direction (31, Fig. 14);

Art Unit: 2875

- A light-emitting surface (3) having a substantially rectangular shape when viewed in said direction of said optical axis (Fig. 12);
- A plurality of semiconductor chips (2) arranged in a single line/array/rectangular matrix (Fig. 16) having a semi-cylindrical transparent member covering said semiconductor chips (Figs. 16 and 17);
- A plurality of semiconductor chips (2) arranged in an array (Fig. 16) whereby
  a rotationally asymmetric light intensity distribution can be obtained around
  the optical axis of the light-emitting element by causing a plurality or all of said
  semiconductor chips to radiate light (Figs. 16 and 17 illustrate an
  asymmetrical/oval transparent member covering said semiconductor chips
  that distributes light in a corresponding rotationally asymmetric/oval nature
  upon radiation of the chips).
- 3. MURATA discloses the claimed invention including a rotationally asymmetric body (31, Fig. 16) as cited above, but does not disclose a fluorescent body filled around a semiconductor chip. However, LEE teaches the use of a fluorescent material disposed about a light source (Fig. 1B, 2) for the purpose of enhancing the overall light intensity of the device (Column 2, Lines 33-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the fluorescent material of LEE into MURATA to provide a light source with enhanced light intensity.
- 4. Regarding Claim 10, MURATA discloses the claimed invention as cited above, except for the ones of said semiconductor chips of different sizes. However, it would

Art Unit: 2875

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate chips of different shapes for the purpose of projecting various light distribution patterns, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the shape of the component. Notably, a change in form of any element of prior patent must result in more than useful natural phenomenon that man has accumulated through common knowledge. Such features cannot sustain patentability where involved is only extended application of obvious attributes from prior art. *Span-Deck Inc. v. Fab-Con Inc.*, 215 USPQ 835. In the case at hand, the advantage of changing the shape of the chips would permit the emission of various patterns.

5. Claims 4 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MURATA (US 4,935,665) in view of LEE (US 6,637,922) as applied to Claims 1 and 5 above, and further in view of SEGOSHI (US 4,868,726). MURATA discloses the claimed invention, but does not disclose semiconductor chips shaped and arranged to produce a projected light pattern having a cut line for a headlamp low beam. However, cut lines and the advantages thereof are well known in the art. SEGOSHI teaches a blind in order to intercept light from a low beam (6, Column 1, Lines 33-41) for the purpose of preventing dazzle or glare to oncoming traffic (Column 1, Lines 42-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify MURATA to include the blind as taught by SEGOSHI in order to produce a light pattern having a cut line in order to control emitted light.

Application/Control Number: 10/699,815 Page 5

Art Unit: 2875

### Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the revised ground(s) of rejection. Notably, the claims and specifically, the phrase "rotationally asymmetrical with respect to the optical axis of the light emitting element", was misconstrued. As such, Examiner has made the requisite adjustments with respect to the presently amended claims and, in the interest of justice, rendered the current action as a second Non-Final.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adam C. Rehm whose telephone number is 571.272.8589. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5:30 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sandra O'Shea can be reached on 571.272.2378. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only: For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/699,815

Art Unit: 2875

ACR 11/30/2005

> ALAN CARIASO PRIMARY EXAMINER